

To: Rader, Cliff[Rader.Cliff@epa.gov]
Cc: Chester, Steven[Chester.Steven@epa.gov]; Bromm, Susan[Bromm.Susan@epa.gov]
From: Giles-AA, Cynthia
Sent: Mon 3/18/2013 12:40:59 AM
Subject: RE: Buffalo Mtn

I think the call can only raise one thing and I think alternatives is the key one. And I am not sure what the key scope issues are - does the letter have a succinct summary of what additional impacts should be included? Will check in tomorrow am.

Thanks Cliff - hope the elbow is better!

Cynthia

From: Rader, Cliff
Sent: Sunday, March 17, 2013 7:59 PM
To: Giles-AA, Cynthia
Cc: Chester, Steven; Bromm, Susan
Subject: Re: Buffalo Mtn

Looks good to me. Would suggest modifying the "if raised" section to recognize that it is not only the Corps that has concerns over the alternatives presented by EPA's consultant. FHWA also raised concerns

Do we also want to talk about scope of analysis with Jo Ellen, or is that a next step after we get some traction on alternatives?

Thx for doing this draft.

From: Giles-AA, Cynthia
Sent: Sunday, March 17, 2013 6:50:05 PM
To: Rader, Cliff
Cc: Chester, Steven; Bromm, Susan
Subject: Buffalo Mtn

Attached are draft talking points for your review. Can you let me know by Monday am if you have any concerns on this? Bob is going to call on Monday. No letter Monday before we touch base with Bob on results of these calls.

Thanks - C